



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,996	09/29/2006	Tsuneo Yasuma	2006_1537A	5788
513 7590 02/07/2008 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 2033 K STREET N. W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021			EXAMINER SOLOLA, TAOFIQ A	
			ART UNIT 1625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/07/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/594,996

Applicant(s)

YASUMA ET AL.

Examiner

Taofiq A. Solola

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____                                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____                           |

Art Unit: 1625

Claims 1-14, 18-20 are pending in this application.

Claim 15-17 are cancelled.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-14, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The claims lack adequate support in the specification. The term "hydrocarbon group" (e.g. claim 1, line 8) is not defined in the specification so as to ascertain structures of the compounds included and/or excluded by the term. It is defined by examples, which themselves are defined by examples. However, "[e]xemplification is not an explicit definition." The specification must set forth the definition explicitly and clearly, with reasonable clarity, deliberateness and precision, *Teleflex Inc. v. Ficosa North Am Corp.*, 63 USPQ2d 1374, (Fed. Cir. 2002), *Rexnord Corp. v. Laitram Corp.*, 60 USPQ2d 1854 (Fed. Cir. 2001).

The term "prodrug" in claims 2, 11-14, 18-20 is not defined in the specification so as to ascertain the structures of compounds that are included and/or excluded by the terms. By deleting the term the rejection would be overcome. Claims 11 and 18 are drawn to all disorders arising from modulation of GPR40: mechanism by which the compounds work in the body. This is not a practical utility under the US patent practice. To ascertain the practical utility, one must read the specification into the claims contrary to several precedent decisions by the US courts

Art Unit: 1625

and Official practice. Even then, the claims would become duplicates of 12, 14, 19-20. Under the US patent practice duplicate or substantial duplicate claims cannot be in the same application. The claims are attempts by applicant to claim treatment of all diseases known today and that may be discovered in the future, arising from the mechanism. They are reach-through claims and are no longer patentable under the US patent practice. A claim must stand alone to define the invention, and incorporation into the claims by reference to the specification or an external source is not permitted. Ex parte Fressola, 27 USPQ 2d 1608, BdPatApp & Inter. (1993). Applicant must show possession of the invention by describing it with all the claimed limitations. *Lookwood v. American Airlines Inc.* 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed Cir. 1997). By deleting the claims the rejection would be overcome.

Claims 1-14, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification does not reasonably provide enablement for using the compounds as prodrugs, for prevention (prophylaxis) and the claimed mechanism. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

"In the context of determining whether sufficient "utility as a drug, medicant, and the like in human therapy" has been alleged, it is proper for the examiner to ask for substantiating evidence unless one with ordinary skill in the art would accept the [compounds and the utilities] as obviously correct." *In re Jolles*, 628 F.2d 1327, 1332 (Fed. Cir. 1980), citing *In re Novak*, 306 F.2d 924 (CCPA 1962); see 340 F.2d 974, 977-78 (CCPA 1965).

"A specification disclosure which contains a teaching of the manner and process of making and using the invention . . . must be taken as in compliance with the enabling requirement of the first paragraph of § 112 unless there is reason to doubt the objective truth of the statements contained therein which must be relied on for enabling support." *In re Brana*, 51

Art Unit: 1625

F.3d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1995), *Id.* at 1566, quoting *Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d 220, 223 (CCPA 1971); *Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 1171-72 (Fed. Cir. 1993), quoting *Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d at 223; see also *Armbruster*, 512 F.2d 676, 677 (CCPA 1975); *Knowlton*, 500 F.2d 566, 571 (CCPA 1974); *Bowen*, 492 F.2d 859 (CCPA 1974); *Hawkins*, 486 F.2d 569, 576 (CCPA 1973).

Where there is “no indication that one skilled in the art would accept without question [the instant compounds and method of use] and no evidence has been presented to demonstrate that the claimed products do have those effects *Novak*, 306 F.2d at 928, an applicant has failed to sufficiently demonstrate sufficient utility and therefore cannot establish enablement.” *In re Rasmusson*, 75 USPQ2d 1297 (CAFC 2005). The claimed invention is not enabled without undue experimentation for the following reasons:

For rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, the following factors must be considered. *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (CAFC, 1988): The factors are a) the breadth of the claims, b) the nature of the invention, c) the state of the prior art, d) the relative skill of those in that art, e) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, f) the amount of direction or guidance presented, g) the presence or absence of working examples, and h) the quantity of experimentation necessary, *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. The breadth of the claims includes all compounds of formula I. The compounds embraced by the claims are so numerous and are in the hundreds of thousands or millions. The nature of the invention is making and using the compounds as pharmaceuticals. Applicant claims all hydrocarbon groups, which are defined in the specification by examples.

The specification fails to disclose how a “normal” human predisposed to all the diseases arising from modification of GPR40 receptor would be identified and how each diseases could be treated.

As for mechanisms, it is quite possible that a mutation in the gene responsible for GPR40 receptor may lead to increase or decrease level. To use the invention as claimed, one of ordinary skill in the art would have to perform experimentation in every instance to determine if the increase or decrease is due to genetic mutation in a patient or not. After prospective patients are identified and treated, assays must be performed on each one to determine if treatment is successful. However, the specification fails to disclose routine procedures to perform such assays. Therefore, to make and use the instant invention, one of ordinary skill in the art would have to perform significant amount of experimentation. Such is deemed undue experiment under the US patent practice.

Finding a prodrug is an empirical exercise. Predicting if a certain ester of a claimed alcohol, for example, is in fact a prodrug that produces the active compound metabolically in man, at a therapeutic concentration and at a useful rate is filled with experimental uncertainty.

Although attempts have been made to predict drug metabolism *de novo*, this is still an experimental science. For a compound to be a prodrug, it must meet three tests. It must itself be biologically inactive. It must be metabolized to a second substance in a human at a rate and to an extent to produce that second substance at a physiologically meaningful concentration. Thirdly, that second substance must be clinically effective. Determining whether a particular compound meets these three criteria requires a large quantity of experimentation. Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry) summarizes the state of the prodrug art in Wolff, Manfred E. "Burger's Medicinal Chemistry, 5ed, Part I", John Wiley & Sons, 1995, pages 975-977. The table on the left side of page 976 outlines the research program to be undertaken to find a prodrug. The second paragraph in section 10 and the paragraph spanning pages 976-977 indicate the low expectation of success. In that paragraph the difficulties of extrapolating between species are further developed.

Since, the prodrug concept is a pharmacokinetic issue the lack of any standard pharmacokinetic protocol in the specification is particularly relevant. Banker, G.S. et al, "Modern Pharmaceutics, 3ed.", Marcel Dekker, New York, 1996, pages 451 and 596, in the first sentence, third paragraph on page 596 states that "extensive development must be undertaken" to find a prodrug. Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry) in the last paragraph on page 975 describes the artisans making prodrugs as collaborative team of synthetic pharmaceutical chemists and metabolism experts. It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved" and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). The specification fails to disclose any study of prodrugs of the instant compounds.

The predictability or lack thereof in the art refers to the ability of one skilled in the art to extrapolate the disclosed or known results to the claimed invention. In the instant invention, the amount of direction and guidance provided by applicant is limited.

There is no evidence in the specification that established nexus between the disclosure and the instantly claimed invention. See *Ex parte Mass*, 9 USPQ2d 1746, (1987).

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "[a] conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding any of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-14, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. For the reason set forth above under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, the claims are indefinite. Applicant must show possession of the invention by describing it with all the claimed limitations. *Lookwood v. American Airlines Inc.* 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed Cir. 1997).

There is no definition for "n" in claim 1, while there is no antecedent basis for "N" in the claim. In claim 3, there is no "Het" in the structure. Therefore, claims 1-14, 18-20 are indefinite.

Claims 2, 11 improperly depend from claim 1 for failure to limit the scope of 1. Also, they expand the scope of 1 by citing "prodrug".

Claims 12-14 are duplicates. Claims 12 and 14 recite intended use of the compounds of the compositions. However, intended use is not a limitation under the US patent practice. *In re Hack*, 114 USPQ 161 (CCPA, 1957); *In re Craig*, 90 USPQ 33 (CCPA, 1951); *In re Brenner*, 82 USPQ 49 (CCPA, 1949). Even then, something old or obvious does not become new upon discovery of new properties, functions or utilities, *In re Best*, 562 F.2d 1252; 195 USPQ 430 (CCPA, 1977). By deleting claims 12 and 14 the rejection would be overcome.

The term "prodrug" in claims 2, 11-14, 18-20 lack proper antecedent basis in claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.



Claims 1-14, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Momose et al., WO 02/053547.

Momose et al., disclose compounds of formula I, their composition and method of use as preventive and/or therapeutic agents for diabetic and related diseases, wherein R<sup>1</sup> is Het; X, Y, U, free valency; Q, W, divalent hydrocarbon groups having 1-20 carbons; A is phenyl (aromatic ring); Z is (CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>n</sub>Z<sup>1</sup>, n is 1-8, Z<sup>1</sup> is O; B is disubstituted benzene; and R<sup>3</sup> is OH and the like. See the abstract.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-14, 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Momose et al., WO 02/053547; and Akerman et al., US 2006/0004012, individually.

Applicant claims compounds of formula I, their composition and method of use as preventive and/or therapeutic agents for diabetic and related diseases.

**Determination of the scope and content of the prior art (MPEP 2141.01)**

Momose et al., teach similar compounds, their composition and methods of using them as preventive and/or therapeutic agents for diabetic and related diseases. See the abstract.

Akerman et al., teach similar compounds, their composition and methods of using them as preventive and/or therapeutic agents for diabetic and related diseases. See the abstract, compounds 10.8-10.13 and 14.4-14.5 in Table 21.

**Ascertainment of the difference between the prior art and the claims (MPEP 2141.02)**

Art Unit: 1625

The difference between the instant invention and that of Momose et al., and Akerman et al., is that the alky chain in the compounds of Applicant at Q, Z or W is longer than in the prior art. In other words, applicant replaced H with alky in the compounds of the prior arts.

The difference between the instant invention and that of Akerman et al., is that Applicant substitutes Het rings from compounds 10.8-10.13 for methoxy groups in compounds 14.4-14.5.

*Finding of prima facie obviousness—rational and motivation (MPEP 2142.2413)*

However, H and alkyl are art recognized equivalents. *In re Lincoln*, 126 USPQ 477, 53 USPQ 40 (CCPA, 1942); *In re Druey*, 319 F.2d 237, 138 USPQ 39 (CCPA, 1963); *In re Lohr*, 317 F.2d 388, 137 USPQ 548 (CCPA, 1963); *In re Hoehsema*, 399 F.2d 269, 158 USPQ 598 (CCPA, 1968); *In re Wood*, 582 F.2d 638, 199 USPQ 137 (CCPA, 1978); *In re Hoke*, 560 F.2d 436, 195 USPQ 148 (CCPA, 1977); *Ex parte Fauque*, 121 USPQ 425 (POBA, 1954); *Ex parte Henkel*, 130 USPQ 474, (POBA, 1960).

When the difference between compounds is the length of a carbon chain such are adjacent homologs. However, adjacent homologs are prima facie obvious. *In re Henze*, 85 USPQ 261 (1950). Therefore, the instant invention is prima facie obvious from the teachings of the prior arts. One of ordinary skill in the art would have known to replace H with alkyl or replace methoxy with het ring at the time the invention was made. The motivation is from knowing that H and alkyl are equivalents, that adjacent homologs would have similar biochemical properties and from compounds 10.8-10.13 by Akerman et al.

***Double Patenting Rejection***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined

Art Unit: 1625

application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-14, 18-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of copending Application No. 10/584,730. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant compounds, compositions and method of use are claimed in US '730, the difference being the scope of the compounds.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Telephone Inquiry***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Taofiq A. Solola, PhD. JD., whose telephone number is (571) 272-0709. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on (571) 272-0867. The fax phone number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Art Unit: 1625



**TAOFIQ SOLOLA**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Group 1625

February 2, 2008